

NO

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Below Average	Below Average	N/A
2002	Average	Average	N/A
2003	Average	Unsatisfactory	No
2004			

PALMETTO ACHIEVEMENT CHALLENGE TESTS (PACT) RESULTS

Our School Middle Schools with Students like Ours English/Language Arts **Mathematics** English/Language Arts **Mathematics**

Definition of Critical Terms

Very high score; very well prepared to work at next grade level; Advanced exceeded expectations **Proficient** Well prepared to work at next grade level; met expectations Met standards; minimally prepared, can go to next grade level Basic Did not meet standards; must have an academic assistance plan; **Below Basic** the local board policy determines progress to the next grade level

NOTE: Science and social studies are to be included in the 2005 school report card.

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS

	Teachers	Students	Parents
Number of surveys returned	48	155	105
Percent satisfied with learning environment	91.3%	68.8%	76.5%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	89.1%	72.5%	63.1%
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	56.5%	87.6%	58.7%

PACT PERFORMANCE BY GROUP Linding to the standard of the stan									
		/sk 0		and a long to the state of the		/ &	Advanced Advanced	and.	
	/.	ent resting	Lested old Be	Basil	Basic oh	Proficient of	Jances	cientand ch	
	Toll	40,10	1621 \ V.	FlOW OF	882 / 0/c	Sko.	Adh Oros	cient arcel	
	\Q, Q	8)	0/0	`			0/01	`/ ઙ૽	
All atomics to			Er	igiisii/Lai	iguage A				
All students	644	100.0	30.8	45.7	19.9	3.6	23.5	17.6	
Gender	040	400.0	05.0	44.4	00.0	0.4	00.0	47.0	
Male Female	312	100.0	35.9	41.1	20.6	2.4	23.0	17.6	
Racial/Ethnic Group	332	100.0	25.7	50.3	19.3	4.7	24.0	17.6	
White	317	100.0	17.0	45.2	31.4	6.4	37.8	17.6	
African-American	318	100.0	44.0	46.0	8.9	1.0	10.0	17.6	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6	
Hispanic	9	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6	
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6	
Disability Status	IN/PA	0.0	11//	IN//	11//1	14//1	14/74	11.0	
Not disabled	496	100.0	26.6	43.7	25.1	4.6	29.7	17.6	
Disabled	148	100.0	45.7	52.7	1.6	N/A	1.6	17.6	
Migrant Status	140		.0.1	,		. 4// \		77.0	
Migrant	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6	
Non-migrant	644	100.0	30.6	45.7	20.1	3.6	23.8	17.6	
English Proficiency									
Limited English proficient	3	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6	
Non-limited English proficient	641	100.0	29.9	46.0	20.4	3.7	24.1	17.6	
Socio-Economic Status									
Subsidized meals	510	100.0	37.5	48.2	12.9	1.3	14.3	17.6	
Full-pay meals	134	100.0	6.3	37.0	44.9	11.8	56.7	17.6	
All students	C44	100.0	37.2	36.6	matics 14.4	11.8	26.2	15.5	
Gender	644	100.0	31.2	30.0	14.4	11.0	20.2	15.5	
Male	312	100.0	35.2	37.3	16.0	11.5	27.5	15.5	
Female	332	100.0	39.2	35.8	12.8	12.2	25.0	15.5	
Racial/Ethnic Group	JJZ	100.0	00.Z	00.0	12.0	14.4	20.0	10.0	
White	317	100.0	21.2	37.8	21.6	19.4	41.0	15.5	
African-American	318	100.0	52.9	35.4	6.9	4.8	11.7	15.5	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5	
Hispanic	9	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5	
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5	
Disability Status	.,,,								
Not disabled	496	100.0	32.5	34.5	18.0	14.9	33.0	15.5	
Disabled	148	100.0	53.5	44.2	1.6	0.8	2.3	15.5	
Migrant Status									
Migrant	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5	
Non-migrant	644	100.0	36.6	36.8	14.6	12.0	26.6	15.5	
English Proficiency		10							
Limited English proficient	3	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5	
Non-limited English proficient	641	100.0	36.1	37.0	14.8	12.1	26.9	15.5	
Socio-Economic Status		100.5	40.	20.5			4-0		
Subsidized meals	510	100.0	43.4	39.3	9.6	7.7	17.3	15.5	
Full-pay meals	134	100.0	15.0	26.8	31.5	26.8	58.3	15.5	

PACT PERFORMANCE BY GRADE LEVEL

		Enolin	May In ale	les ologi	9/04.	Bigg	610	Adv olo Profi
		/ V V	7	/ 0/0	n/Langua	/		ala
A	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2002	Grade 6	179	N/A	20.2	44.4	23.6	11.8	35.4
	Grade 7	207	N/A	37.6	42.1	14.4	5.9	20.3
\blacksquare	Grade 8	190	N/A	32.8	48.6	15.3	3.3	18.6
lack	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ဗ	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2003	Grade 6	235	100.0	28.1	47.0	19.8	5.1	24.9
	Grade 7	208	100.0	27.1	47.3	22.9	2.7	25.5
	Grade 8	201	100.0	38.0	42.5	16.8	2.8	19.6

	Mathematics											
	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
2002	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
20	Grade 6	179	N/A	31.5	42.7	16.3	9.6	25.8				
	Grade 7	207	N/A	51.0	27.7	10.4	10.9	21.3				
•	Grade 8	190	N/A	42.6	45.9	8.2	3.3	11.5				
	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
8	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
2003	Grade 6	235	100.0	28.6	39.2	16.1	16.1	32.3				
	Grade 7	208	100.0	38.8	31.9	14.9	14.4	29.3				
lacktriangle	Grade 8	201	100.0	45.8	38.5	11.7	3.9	15.6				

SCHOOL PROFILE

C	Our School	Change from Last Year	Middle Schools with Students Like Ours	Median Middle School
Students (n= 645)				
Students enrolled in high school credit courses (grades 7 & 8)	44.4%	Up from 13.5%	7.5%	14.4%
Retention rate	5.2%	Up from 4.9%	3.9%	2.3%
Attendance rate Eligible for gifted and talented	96.3%	Up from 95.9%	94.5%	95.2%
	14.2%	Up from 11.3%	6.8%	13.6%
On academic plans On academic probation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
With disabilities other than speech Older than usual for grade	21.9%	Down from 24.0%	15.9%	14.1%
	5.9%	Up from 5.3%	6.7%	4.9%
Suspended or expelled	7.4%	Up from 2.7%	2.9%	1.3%
Annual dropout rate	0.0%	No change	0.0%	0.0%
Teachers (n= 48)				
Teachers with advanced degrees Continuing contract teachers	20.8%	Down from 34.0%	42.9%	47.1%
	81.3%	Up from 74.5%	78.4%	82.5%
Highly qualified teachers Teachers returning from previous year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	84.8%	Down from 87.5%	80.8%	84.3%
Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary	94.9%	Down from 95.2%	94.7%	95.0%
	\$40,297	Down 3.1%	\$39,288	\$39,924
Prof. development days/teacher	16.5 days	Up from 10.7 days	11.2 days	10.7 days
School				
Principal's years at school	1.0	Down from 6.0	2.0	3.0
Student-teacher ratio	22.8 to 1	Up from 20.7 to 1	19.8 to 1	21.0 to 1
Prime instructional time Dollars spent per pupil*	90.6%	No change	87.8%	88.9%
	\$6,558	Up 7.4%	\$6,266	\$5,854
Percent spent on teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts	61.8%	Up from 60.8%	60.1%	62.0%
	Good	No change	Good	Good
Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation	94.6%	Down from 97.0%	94.6%	94.8%
	yes	N/A	yes	yes

^{*} Prior year audited financial data are reported.

	Our District	State	
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A	
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A	

		•		-
Ahhra	WISTIAN	c tor	Missina	I lata

						Ū			
1	N/A	Not Applicable	N/C	Not Collected	N/R	Not Reported	I/S	Insufficient Sample	

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Loris Middle School completed its final year in our facility on Church Street and moved into a brand-new, state-of-the-art building on Highway 66 in June 2003. The old building was commemorated with a solemn closing ceremony on June 4. We anticipate stronger student results as many hindrances and obstacles inherent in the old site are left behind and opportunities in the new are embraced.

Students at Loris Middle were recognized for many accomplishments:

Seven students were identified as South Carolina Junior Scholars.

Three students were identified as Duke Tip Scholars.

A seventh grader's Soil and Water Essay was chosen best in the District.

A student earned recognition in the Johns Hopkins University talent search. An eighth grader placed second in the region in the MathCounts competition.

Our students earned over 23,000 Accelerated Reader (A.R.) points.

Fifteen students were selected for All-County Middle School Chorus, and five students were selected for the All-County Band. The band earned a "Superior" rating at Carowinds.

Our orchestra completed its first year of existence with ten members.

Eleven students fulfilled all requirements of the "Wright Flight" program and co-piloted an airplane as a result.

We continued, improved, and/or implemented various programs to encourage student achievement: Our daily tutorial/enrichment period was lengthened to 30 minutes and moved to an earlier time in the day. A.R. program participation was encouraged with monthly awards, assembly recognition, and incentives. We installed the software, trained teachers, and implemented the Academy of Reading computer program. District and state-provided learning specialists worked with our teachers to improve instructional practices. Nineteen staff members completed a three-hour graduate course through the SC Reading Initiative. Many after- and before-school remediation opportunities were provided for students. A weekly newsletter, the "Lion Lines," was developed to enhance communication between the school and parents.

We anticipate a continued, strong relationship with our High Performance Partnership, PTO, and School Improvement Council members and continually seek to strengthen our volunteer and mentoring efforts. A program for the boys in our school, "Male Call," will be implemented and our "Wright Flight" program, through the Myrtle Beach Daedalians, will be expanded. Our algebra and pre-algebra programs will be enhanced with the addition of the "I Can Learn" computer lab. We also plan to refine our A.R., Renaissance, and minority achievement efforts.

We continue to seek your support as we strive to provide a strong education for your children. If ever you have a question or a comment, do not hesitate to contact us

Scott Mercer, Principal

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.